

A Farther
A C C O U N T
OF THE
Baroccian Manuscript,

Lately published at *Oxford*, together with the Canons
Omitted in that Edition.

In a Letter to his Friend in London.

Enquire after the Old ways.

SIR,
YOU Surprise me with the *Baroc-*
cian Manuscript, but much more
with the Account of the Credit
it has gotten. Its Admirers, I presume,
take it to be an excellent *Traſt* upon *R. B's*
word, and fancy (vixna) Providence was
concerned in the discovery and Publica-
tion of this piece. I muſt confeſs Provi-
dence has of late been thought very buſie,
but I can aſſure you that Treatiſe was
known in my time, and deſpiſed too. The
Reaſons you will meet with anon, and
after a ſhort Examination, I dare be confi-
dent you will confeſs it deſerves no bet-
ter uſage.

The *Editor* endeavours to get ſome Re-
putation to this piece, by fathering it up-
on * *Niaphorus Calliſti*, a Man
(he ſays) better ſkilled in Eccle-
ſiaſtical Hiſtory than any of the ſame Age.
Now, Sir, you know this Age was the
13th Century, a time not over-ſtockt
with Church Hiſtorians of any Credit;
and therefore tho' he was the beſt of that
Age, yet the Cenſures of other Critics

* may be juſt, who ſay he
was an idle Story-teller, of li-
tle Judgment but much Super-
ſtition. But not to quarrel
about *Niaphorus*, let us look
upon the reaſons why the *Editor* fancies
him to be the Author of this Treatiſe.

1ſt. He ſays this Piece is found in a
Book markt *CXLII* amongſt
the * *Baroccian MSS* in that
Bodleian Library at *Oxford*, in which Book
there are ſome Hiſtorical Treatiſes, and
particularly a Catalogue of the Patriarchs
of *Conſtantinople* under *Niaphorus's* name.
This is all true, but the *Editor* ſhould
have obſerved that that Book is a bundle
of ſeveral Treatiſes of ſeveral Authors,
and particularly that this *Traſt* is writ-
ten in a different hand from thoſe to
which the name of *Niaphorus* is affixt. So
that from the Book it ſelf there is not the
leaſt reaſon to conjecture that *Niaphorus*
compiled this piece.

He further ſaith that *Niaphorus* muſt be
the Author, becauſe the Compiler may be

* vid Baroc. Not.
ad AB. A. 1. 1. 1.
1. n. 13. & C.
ſubſcripta Exerciſ.
1. 1. 1. 1. 1.

* Pref. p. 1.

* Pref. p. 1.

suppos'd to live within the Patriarcha of *Constantinople*, and about the time *Niaphornus* flourished. There, he says, *are no light conjectures*. And indeed *Niaphornus* is much obliged to him for giving him a title to all the nameless follys of that Age. But if the *Editor* would have shown himself a true Critick, he would have compared the matter and stile of this Treatise with *Niaphornus's* History; and then he would have found that *Niaphornus* had a better Pen; more Judgment and Sincerity than this Collector. At least he would have considered that a Favorite of an Emperor, who mortally hated the *Latins*, would not have used the

Authority of the Bishops of *Rome*, when he might have met with as great Examples in his own Church: The best account I can give of the *Manuscript* is this. The Compiler of it seems to be a *Latiniz'd Greek*, and at the time when he wrote it he was a kind of a Tutor, and this piece was a reading to his *Boys*, so injudiciously compos'd, and in so mean a stile, that nothing but the Barbarity of the Age, and the meanness of the Auditory can make any tolerable excuse for it. To think it a *Homily*, and pronounced in a Council of Bishops (as the *Editor* seems willing to opine) is to libel a Century;

for how can a Man disgrace an Age more then by supposing the Bishops, the Men of Wisdom and Authority in it could patiently sit out such an indigested crude tale? Had it still lain amongst the *Boys*, it had been in its proper place; but to bring it out to *Men*, and triumph in the Discovery, shows only that some do not know what *Manuscripts* are worth printing. With this Character I should leave the Author, but *R. B.* deserves a

little more respect; and therefore, pray tell him when you see him next, that the *Oxford* Copy of this Treatise is not the only Copy in the world; *Cotelerius* had one of the same piece, and had that great Man lived a little longer, it would have been published, and no doubt with the *Canon* at the end of it (the Reason why these were left out in this Edition you will meet with in the Close of this Paper) and then *Providence* had not reserved it for *Mr. Hody's* version, nor *R. B.'s* preface.

However the Church of *England* is now on fire, and the *Nehemim* is ready with his Buckets and Ladders to put it out. The first affront is to give the *depriv'd* Bishops advice out of *St. Clemens*, and perswade them to resign. (There would not be much need of this if the People were already free.) 'Tis true, *St. Clemens* not only advises the injured Presbyters at *Corinth*, but tells them it was their real interest to with-draw; but then this Council comes after a very severe Lecture to the People for their disobedience. He tells them (Sect. 1.) their desertion was impious, and despicable fomented by bold impudent Men, and a great Scandal to Religion. He admonisheth them to right their injured Ministers, and tells them they had been diligent in their Office, and were great Ornaments of the Church. (Sect. 44.) he adds that they lay under a great Sin. *ἀμαρτία γὰρ ἡ μὴ εἶναι ἐπὶ τοῖς ἀδικήταις, ὡς εἶναι ἀποστόλους καὶ τὰ ὅμοια τοῖς ἐπισκοπῶν ἀπολόγημα.* (Sect. 44.) Nor is that venerable Father less Zealous in his Address to the People to adhere, (even after he had given this advice to the Presbyters, Sect. 57.) than

vid. Coteler.
Nat. in 2d Tom.
Men. Sec. 2.
645. compared
with p. 25. lin.
14. of the G. &
2d Edition.

Pres. p. 3.

Pres. p. 8.

Seb. 54.
Edit. Oxon.

to the *Presbyters* to recede from an obstinate Generation. Yet I shall freely own the direction is excellent; and who would more freely follow it then the present *Bishops*, were the case of the Church of England like that of *Corinth*? But let us suppose that by such a recess the *Laws* of the *Empire* had been violated, the *Doctrines* of the Church, for which they had suffered Persecution, the mockings of the wordly, and the railing of the Proud, exposed; and that *Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction* which Christ settled on the Apostles, and they delivered to their Successors, betrayed; and then would St. *Clement* have advised them to with-draw? Any man may answer that he was St. *Paul's* companion, and therefore doubtless of his opinion who would not give place to *Intruders* ('tis the *Editor's* word) so much as for one hour, *Gal. 2. v. 5.*

The next advice comes from St. *Austin* and almost three hundred *African Bishops*, who offer'd to resign their *Bishopricks* to preserve the *Unity* of the Church: and no doubt they had made a very good purchase. But is there no way, to preserve the *Unity* of the Church but the *Resignation* of the *Injur'd*? Will not their *Restoration* do as well? and would it not be a more *Christian* application to address the *Intruders* to make reparation, and do right to God and Man at once? the *Injur'd* may with-draw, but the *Injurious* I am sure, are bound to do it by greater and stronger obligations, than those that come from *African*, however venerable Examples.

But here, Sir, I must beg leave to expostulate a little, and desire to know what grievous offence I committed, that I must be enjoyned the ungrateful penance of examining a piece, in which I can meet

with nothing but confidence, *disingenuity* and *senfisse*. For I have reason to believe the *Editor* never lookt into St. *Austin*, nor the *Conference* at *Carthage* which he quotes; had he seen the Books, he would not have given *Marcellinus* another title then that he meets with in them: *Marcellinus* is called *Tribunus* *Notarius* and *Cognitor*, but never *Vicegerens*, and the Emperors *Honorius* and *Theodosius* constitute him only Moderator of the Assembly with power to give sentence after a full hearing of the *Catholick Bishops*, and the party of *Donatus*, *Cui quidem* *Disputationi* *principio* *locus* *re* *iudicem* *volantibus* *residere*.

Nor had it been possible for a Man of so much Zeal for *Unity*, as the *Editor* pretends, to have mangled the *Catholick Bishop's* Letter to *Marcellinus*, or given another state of the matter then what St. *Austin* had drawn up. The whole Letter is too long to be transcribed, & therefore you must content your self with that venerable *Father's* abstract of it. *In* *is* *dem* *litteris* *etiam* *se* *obstrinxerunt* *Catholici* *&* *pollisiti* *sunt*, *si*

in *pacte* *Donati* *veritas* *eis* *demonstraretur* *Ecclesia*, *non* *se* *illuc* *Episcopalem* *Honorem* *quasituros*; *sed* *consilium* *eorum* *secuturos* *pro* *salute* *Christianã*: *si* *autem* *in* *sua* *Communione* *potius* *veritas* *est* *aderetur* *Ecclesie*, *Honores* *Episcopales* *eis* *se* *non* *negaturos*: *&* *hoc* *a* *se* *fieri* *bono* *paci*, *ut* *intelligerent* *His* *quibus* *hoc* *præstaretur* *in* *ijs* *Catholici* *non* *Christianam* *Consecrationem*, *sed* *humanum* *direstarentur* *errarem*. *Quod* *si* *Plebes* *duos* *in* *una* *Ecclesia* *Episcopos* *ferre* *non* *possent*, *Utrisque* *de* *medio* *recedentibus* *singuli*, *confruerentur* *Episcopi*, *ab* *ijs* *Episcopis* *ordinandi*

Passim *in* *Coll. Carth. ag. tom. 2. Conc. and in* *Breviculo ejusdem Coll. inter op. August. tom. 7.*

vid Council. tom. 2. p. 1346.

Breviculus Coll. Carth. primæ dici Sect. 5. inter Op. August. tom. 7.

quis in suis Plebibus singuli invenirentur. The Catholic Bishops did not offer to resign, but upon condition the party of Donatus would do so too: And therefore the Editor before he made use of this Example, should have gotten a Commission to propose it.

The next is drawn from the behaviour of Gregory the Divine, but this Story told right, will show him to be no very passing Example in this case.

* At least a Coadjutor to his Father. vid. Vals[e] Nor. ad C. 5. Cap. 7. Socratis.

¶ Gregory's Letter de Gregor. ad Socrates Hist. Eccles. C. 5. 6. 7. ved. Eriani forum. C. 5. l. 7.

Gregory was Bishop of Nazianzum, * and thence translated to Constantinople; Many || murmured at this promotion, and indeed Translations were not then thought as Innocent as they are now. The great Eusebius of Caesarea had not very long before refused the Throne of Antioch, when offer'd to him: He pleaded, that he could not leave his old Charge without breaking the Apostolical Canons, & violating his first Faith.

vid. Euseb. de vita Constantini L. 3. C. 59, 60, 61, 62.

His excuse was accepted, and the Honesty of it very much commended by Constantine the Great, who loved him very well, and desired his promotion. Eusebius of Nicomedia is censur'd as a Breaker of the Ecclesiastical Constitution for leaving his own See, and stepping into the Throne of Constantinople. And Theodoris in the second Book of his Ecclesiastical History, Cap. 31. tells us the Arrians were the chief promoters of Translations; and bitterly reproaches them for transferring Bishops from one City to another. His case standing thus, and his Interest at Court, being little, Gregory did not think

Theodoris. Eccles. Hist. l. 1. C. 9.

it worth while to struggle for a Seat, in which he found he should be briskly oppos'd, and poorly defended: and therefore he resigned. Nectarius, an Honourable person, and a Man of great worth: was chosen in his room, with him Gregory communicates; and why should he not since he had resigned? He writes to him, and gives him honourable titles, and is this so wonderful a Condescension in Gregory when Nectarius was a greater Bishop, and a Man Superior to Himself? Nectarius had done Gregory no injury, he neither sought his Throne, nor accepted it till duly vacant by his Resignation: why then should Gregory be angry? But some Men have reason to wonder at others who are civil and do their duty. The last is drawn from that Council which Dionysius of Alexandria gives Novatian to forgo his pretence to the Roman Chaire: Pref. p. 8.

vid. vitam Greg. Naz. p. 27.

And this I must confess is very judiciously apply'd. For Novatian unless my Eusebius very much deceives me, was the Intruder, and stept into the Roman Throne before Cornelius the rightful Bishop was willing to go out of it.

Socrat. Hist. Eccles. l. 5. C. 8.

vid. Euseb. Hist. Eccl. l. 6. C. 43. & 45.

I had almost forgot St Chrysostom, and it had been well for the Editor if I had. He seems to be in love with the Story, and flourishes more upon it, than upon any of the Rest. But he has not consider'd that St Chrysostom never offer'd to resign. That great Man knew well enough his Enemys sought his Life, they had accus'd him of Treason, and he expected to lose his Head publicly, or to be murder'd privately by those who were to carry him into Banishment; and therefore expecting Death, he desires his Brethren

Pref. p. 8.

Prisf. p. 4.

vid. the Case of Chrysostom in this Treatise.

Brethren the *Bishops*, to communicate with his *Orthodox Successor*, and enjoyns the *Widows* to submit. Observe his own words. *I have fought a good Fight, my end is nigh, and my Race is finished.* But to the last moment of his Life he never sat quiet under that *unjust Sentence* which deposed him. Many *Bishops* stood close to him, the *Widows, Virgins*, and People of *Constantinople* could not be forced by Fines, Whippings, and Imprisonments, to forsake him, and communicate with the other party, And he himself made Applications to the *Bishops of Rome, Milan, and Aquileia* to stand his Friends, and to restore him to his Throne: If this be an Example of *Submission*, let the Editor apply it, and try whether it will not fit the *stiffest* of the present Age.

You must forgive me, if I do not take much notice of the Description of a *Schismatick*, which the Editor gives out of *Irenæus*: 'tis too *rhine* in the Application. Can any of the *De-throned Bishops* be supposed to have an eye upon *Utilitatum & Res Medicas*, Wealth and Profit? Take a view of them in the Tower, and there you will find them exposing not only their *Estates* but *Lives* too for the good of the Church.

I should here leave the Editor, and proceed to the *Treatise*, but that you think it necessary to pay *Counsel* with *Advice*, and therefore I must beg the Editor, whensoever he ventures to write again, to use Civil and respectful Expressions when he speaks of his *Superiours, Bishops* by title and by merit; and to remember that the *Nethenims* were never permitted to bring rotten wood, or dirty water into the Sanctuary. Not to make Speeches for *St Chrysostom*, or any Orator of his rank, and not to consult references and quotations

shown him by his Friends, but to read Books, and compare the several passages in them, and then I am sure we shall hear less of his Examples.

The Pamphlet pretends; that the Church never troubled her self about the Promotion of a *Bi-* shop, nor his Right to the Throne he fill'd; but communicated with him who was in possession of the See (provided he was *Orthodox*) though another had been violently and unjustly thrust out of it; and had not resigned his right to the Seat, and was still alive: This practice it doth not attempt to justify, by any Principles drawn from *Scripture*, the *Ancient Canons* or *Customs* of the Church; nor the Writings of the *three first Ages*, but only cites some few examples from the *third* to the *thirteenth* Century, and then concludes as triumphantly, as if it had given the fullest demonstration in the world.

Now, Sir, you know this bare telling of *Storys* is the meanest way of arguing, the work of *memory* only, and to be managed without *thought*; 'tis likewise of very little force, because we ought to be privy to all the *Circumstances*, and certain of the *Integrity* of the Man, whose *Practice* is brought to justify it self: We should be sure that neither *fear*, nor *Interest*, nor any other motive sway'd him in the least, and that he was well informed, duly consider'd, and did not act upon mistake. Now all this is not easily discover'd, nor are the *Best* and *wisest* Men always in the right, nor *Sincere* all over. No action is good, imitable, or just barely because done by such or such a Man; We must walk by *Rule* and not *Example*. Nor can you, I am sure, be insensible that this Treatise will justify the proceedings of an *unjust violent deposing Prince*, as well

Answer to the M.S

as those of a complying communicating Clergy, because several of the Emperors which it mentions were better and wiser Men than many of the Bishops. And if Examples when truly reported have so little force, what must those have that are partly feign'd, unfaithfully related, and will not reach the case for which they are produced? 'tis certain they can have no influence on the cause, but then they turn with a vengeance on the Collector of them, and sufficiently prove very lamentable defects in his judgment, or something worse.

The Pamphlet in its title excepts the case of *St Chrysostom* as not favourable to his design, and yet begins with an account of that Excellent Bishop. It says *Chrysostom* (as well as *St Basil*) was ordained Deacon by *Meletius*, who had formerly been made Bishop of *Sebastia* by the *Arrians*, and was afterward translated to the Throne of *Antioch* by the Suffrages both of the *Arrians* and *Orthodox*.

Eustathius the old Bishop of *Antioch*, being then in Exile and alive. It adds that this *Meletius* thus ordained, and thus seated in the Throne of *Antioch*, was, because he was *Orthodox*, accepted by, and proved very beneficial to the Church. 'Tis true, *Chrysostom* was ordained Deacon by *Meletius*, and *Meletius* made Bishop of *Sebastia* by such as were *Arrians* in their hearts, but not publick abettors of that Heresie. They were *Hypocrites* indeed, and under the specious pretence of reconciling differences, and making up the breaches of the Church, advanced the project of a naked Gospel; such as *Meletius*, who was always *Orthodox* himself, did not suspect to be unsound in the Faith; and such as at that time were not separated from the Communion of the

Church; and therefore *Meletius* had no reason to refuse their ordination; and the *Eustathians* were too peevish to question it afterward, and justly accounted guilty of the Schism that divided the Church of *Antioch*.

But that *Eustathius* (which is the main point) was alive when *Meletius* came to the See of *Antioch*, is false, as appears from *Theodorit*. Hist. Eccles. l. 3. C. 4.

ἡ δὲ τῆς Μελίτιου χειροτονία Εὐσταθίου τῆς αὐτοῦτος. The Editor to support his Author, cites

Socrates. l. 4. c. 14, and 15. and pag. 4.

Sozomen l. 6. c. 13. who say *Eustathius* was recall'd from Banishment by the Emperor *Jovian*, and sent again into Exile by *Valens*, and therefore was alive when *Meletius* was put into the Throne of *Antioch* in the time of *Constantine*. He professeth likewise that he cannot agree with *Baronius* and *Valesius* (no mean, nor unthinking Men) who take *Socrates* and *Sozomen* to be mistaken in the Story.

I must confess that *Eustathius* (as the Editor observes against *Valesius*

(might have liv'd to the third pag. 4.

Consulship of *Valentinian* and *Valens*; for then he had not been above ninety years of age; and therefore the Story of *Socrates* and *Sozomen* is not to be rejected on that Account. But is this the Argument of *Baronius*, or doth *Valesius* produce no other? Had he lookt into the *Annals*, An. 370. he would have found that *Baronius* thought it absurd to imagin that the *Oxthodox* Bishops, and Catholick People of *Antioch* would have suffer'd *Meletius* or *Paulinus* to have sate in that Chaire, had *Eustathius* been alive: that 'tis incredible he should not repaire to *Antioch*, and appear in the Catholick Synod at that time; and folly to fancy that *Meletius* and *Paulinus* would not have given

given place to him, and to put an end to the Schism in that Church; and *Valerius* proves from *St Jerom* that *Eustathius* of *Antioch* was buried at *Trajanople* in *Thrace*, to which place he was banished by *Constantinus* (it should be *Constantine*) and therefore could not be that *Eustathius* who was banished by *Valens* to *Bizua* in *Thrace*. But these are Arguments not very favorable to the *Edict*'s designs, and therefore must be shuffled over, and concealed: So that we have a full Testimony of *Theodoris*, who wrote his History to supply the Defects, and correct the mistakes of *Socrates* and *Sozomen*, and the Authority of *St Jerom* against a senseless furnish of one single *Socrates*, (for *Sozomen* transcribes him) who was neither so accurate nor judicious as either of the other two. But to put this matter out of all doubt, I shall only desire it may be observed that the *Orthodox* never chose a Bishop in the room of one who was thrust out of his Throne, whilest he was alive, and therefore it cannot be suppos'd that the *Orthodox* of *Antioch* would have given their votes for *Melitus*, had *Eustathius* been in being; and consequently it must be concluded that *Theodoris* is in the right, because his account agrees with the Practice of the Church.

For the first three hundred years *Dius* and *Germanius* were the only Men who sat in *anorth's* Throne, but then *Narcissus* being under some disgrace, had voluntarily withdrawn from *Jerusalem*, and no body knew where he was. The Flock was forsaken before they had

provided for themselves. When the Bishops were martyr'd, new ones were quickly chosen in their room, but when they were banisht, or forc'd to fly, their Chairs were thought to be still full: And *Dionysius* the famous Bishop of *Alexandria*, who was banisht from his City, gives a very good reason for these different proceedings of the Christians in his time,

And *St Hilary* in the next Age could tell *Constantinus*, *Episcopus ego sum licet in exilio permanens, & Ecclesia adhuc per Presbyteros meos Communionem distribuens*. An unjust deprivation did not take away their right, though driven from their Church, they kept their Character, and were Bishops still: The Churches of those Ages knew as well as *St Chrysostom* that it was necessary for them to be under Bishops, but they never thought their obligations to their Pastors were cancelled, when they were depos'd by the Edict of an Emperor, and forced to be absent from their Charge.

To confirm these Assertions you may command a great many Instances from the Churches of *France*, *Italy*, *Asia*, *Aegypt*, and the like, at present I shall only send you one from *Rome*. *Liberius* was banisht by *Constantinus* for refusing to consent to *Athanasius*'s deposition, and a perjured party of the *Roman* Clergy, put one *Felix* in his Room, who was *Orthodox* himself, but being a *Latin* and a *Reconciler*, and a Trimmer in his practice communicated with the *Arians*: The sober, pious

Catholic

vid. Not. ad l. a.
e. 14. & 15. Hist.
Eccles. Socratis.

vid. Cave's Hist. Lit.

vid. Valef. pref. ad
Hist. Theodoris.

vid. Valef. pref. ad
Hist. Socratis and
Sozomen.

vid. Euseb. lib. 6.
cap. 9. and 10.

vid. Euseb. lib. 7.
c. xi.

Hil. Liber. ad Con-
stantinum.

Prof. p. 1.

vid. Pref. ad Libet-
tina procon. Paschal.
& Marcelinus.

vid. Socrat. lib. 2.
c. 17. & Sozomen. l. 4.
c. 11. Theodoris.
l. 2. c. 17.

Catholicks of Rome with-drew from his Communion; and made application to *Constantina*, for their restoration of their old *Bishop*: partly indeed because *Felix* communicated with the *Arrians*, but

chiefly because *St. Cyril*, *St. Theodor.* lib. 2. c. 17. *St. Epiphanius*, *St. Irenaeus* there was but one God, one Christ, and one Bishop.

The Pamphlet pretends farther that the Ordinations of *Arfacius* (who upon the unjust deposition of *St. Chrysostom*, was put into the Throne of *Constantinople*) were never question'd, and yet owns that we are not certain he made any. And then adds that *Atticus*, who succeeded *Arfacius* in that See, whilst *Chrysostom* was in Exile and alive,

was own'd and accepted by the Church, and commended by Pope *Celestine*: that *Sisinnius* the Successor of *Atticus* was consecrated by those whom

Atticus ordained, that the third general Council of *Ephesus* took no notice of any of these proceedings, and in the following paragraph goes on to shew that *Maximian* and *Proclus* the

succeeding Bishops of *Constantinople* deriv'd their ordination from the same hands; that *St. Cyril* communicated with them, and that *Innocent* of *Rome* did not prosecute *Severianus* of *Gabala* nor *Acacius* of *Berea*, though he knew them to be the chief contrivers of all these Injuries, which *St. Chrysostom* suffer'd. Here is a great deal of History, but to what purpose? our question is not whether the Ordinations of Intruders are good and valid (even those of *Schismatics* and *Hetics* have been frequently admitted) nor whether the Church might not own an Intruder after the death of the injured Bishop; nor whether every Bishop is bound

to prosecute those who have done Injury to others: But whether the Church has received, and communicated with such as have step'd into other mens Seats whilst they were alive, and had not resign'd their right. To this point the Author should have spoken, he should have shewn that *Arfacius* or *Arctius* was received and owned by the Church whilst *Chrysostom* was in Exile; but since that could not be done, as will appear from the following Abstract taken out of the Life of *St. Chrysostom*, written by *Palladius*, the Question was to be changed, and the dispute shuff'd.

St. Chrysostom, Bishop of *Constantinople*, was a man of a severe temper (p. 45.) vehemently against the Vices of the great, and therefore not very acceptable at Court (p. 35.) *Theophilus* of *Alexandria* a bold insinuating fellow, having some disgust to him (p. 44.) undertakes the quarrel of the Court, proceeds against all Rules and Canons, gathers a packt Synod, condemns and deprives *Chrysostom* without hearing his defence (p. 74.) when *Chrysostom* was summon'd by the Emperor to appear before *Theophilus*, he had forty Bishops with him, of which number seven were Metropolitans (p. 67. and 69.) and to these he spoke words, which the Editor has quoted in his Preface. He charges them not to leave their Churches, but communicate with his Orthodox Successor, for He expected death (p. 67.) It being the publick report that He should lose his Head. (p. 68.) After this deprivation he was restored, and kept his Seat some time; till *Theophilus*'s party grew strong, and condemn'd him again; and to put this Sentence in Execution, *Theophilus* gets a Warrant from Court, sends the Sheriff

(p. 19. and 75.) with his Pals to drive him out of his Palace and Church too. And (p. 26.) engages the Emperor to deprive and confiscate the Estates of all those Bishops who should refuse to communicate with *Arsacius*, who was put into the Chair of *St John*, and to seize upon the House of any Man who harbor'd any Priest that communicated with *John*. The Honourable *Deaconesses* of *Constantinople* were Fin'd, the *Virgins* whipt, and the *Monks* tortur'd, yet still *Arsacius* was refused. *Arsacius* living but fourteen months, *Atticus* succeeds him, (p. 94.) with whom none of the Bishops, nor the People of *Constantinople* would communicate (pag. 95.) He procures *Edicts* to force them, (p. 95.) some were prevail'd on by Benefices and Bribes, but abundance of Rich and Noble Persons fled (p. 95.) many Bishops suffer'd deprivation (p. 194.) and notwithstanding the severe Laws, more of the People of *Constantinople* separated from *Atticus* than joyn'd with him (p. 96. and 149.) In the mean time *St John* makes application to the Bishops of the West, to *Innocent* of *Rome* (p. 10.) *Chromatius* of *Aquila* and *Venerius* of *Adrian* (p. 22, and 23.) desiring them to interpose and do him right. Many Bishops and Presbyters made the same addresses for *St John* (p. 28.) *Innocent* offers to communicate with *Theophilus* and *Chrysostom* till the cause should be determined (p. 23.) but *Theophilus* declining a review of his proceedings, *Innocent* by the advice of an *Italian Synod*, requests the Emperor *Honorius* to write to his Brother *Arcadius* to summon a Council, that it might be known with whom they should communicate. (p. 30.) The five Bishops who carried the Emperor's Letters, refused to communicate with *Atticus* (p. 33.) *Palladius* glorys in his

refusal (p. 214.) and tells us, p. 214. that a *Western Synod* had determin'd not to communicate with the *Intruders*, nor with those who joyn'd with them. 'Tis needless to comment upon this History, for when the deliberate determinations of whole Churches, the resolutions of *Chrysostom*, and the best Men of the Age are on one side; and the violence only and fury of a desperate faction on the other, 'tis easy to determine which ought to be preferr'd

The next Instance is less to the purpose, but as unfaithfully reported as the former. It says *Dioscorus* of *Alexandria* openly favoring *Eutyches* pag. 10. his Heresy, condemn'd, despos'd, and murdered *Flavian* the Orthodox Bishop of *Constantinople*, and ordain'd *Anatolius* in his Room, yet the fourth general Council did not depose *Anatolius*, nor censure *Juvenal* of *Jerusalem*, nor the rest who joyn'd with *Dioscorus* in deposing *Flavian*. But did not the Council of *Chalcedon* call *Juvenal* of *Jerusalem*, *Basil* of *Seleucia* and the Rest to an Account for their proceedings against *Flavian*? And

Baronius An. 449.

did not they plead for their excuse that *Dioscorus* had put a guard upon them, that they were beaten by the Souldiers, and almost famished: that they were under the greatest Terror, Swords being at their Throats, and Chains brought into the Room, and that they subscribed his deposition against their Conscience and out of fear? That they heartily repented for what they had done, and beg'd pardon both of God and Man?

If any one denies this, the Acts of the Council at *Chalcedon* will sufficiently confute him, and *Evagrius* will prove that a sentence of deposition was drawn against them all, and that their Restoration was

Council tom. 4. p. 117.

Evagri. Hist. Eccl. l. 2. c. 4. and Baronius An. 451.

lookt upon as a kindness and favor from Pope Leo. *ἡμεῖς μὲν ὁ ἀποστόλος ὅπως συγγράμματα ἀποστόλων ἐν τοῖς ἐκκλησίαις καὶ μετὰ τῶν αὐτῶν ἀποστόλων.* As for *Anatolius* himself, the

As for *Anatolius* himself, the Council had no reason to deprive Him, for those that ordain'd him were not declared Hereticks, nor separated from the Church; He was *Orthodox* himself, and put into the Throne of *Constantinople* before the death of *Flavi-*

Baronius torn. 6. f. 100. *Flavianus*: for *Flavianus* was murdered not long (*Niapherns* says within a few days) after

Niaphorus l. 14. c. 47. in a few days) after his deposition, and the Pamphlet it self says Dioscorus was pag. 10. Murdered before he ordained

Baronius An. 451.

* *Baronius An.* 452. compared with Leo's *Epistles to Anatolius, Martian & Pulcheria* in the 4th Tome of the *Councils*, p. 843. 846. and 848.

Wedges of our Sec.

The Pamphlet goes on to the Reign of Anastasius, and says the Empecor depriv'd three Patriarchs, *Euphemius, Macedonius, and Timotheus*, because they would not Subscribe his Heretical Opinions. These three did not refuse one another's Communion; and *Elias of Jerusalem* did communicate with all three. [This was the

Theodorus Leß r p.
 559. Metaphrastes, The-
 ophanes, and Cedrenus
 and others call him Euph-
 rymius, and therefore
 all Historians do not call
 him Euphemius, as the
 Editor asserts, p. 13. vid.
 Cotelieri. Not. ad 3. tom.
 Mon. Græc. p. 499.

Enemys. The Emperor calls a Synod, and *Euphemius* was deposed, so that he was not thrust out by the Emperor, but regularly displaced.

Yet the People of *Constantinople* rais'd tumults, and could scarce be perswaded to forsake him; *Macedonius* succeeds him, with whom *Euphemius* did not so well agree as the *Pamphlet* pretends; *Euphemius* indeed made use of him upon a civil occasion, and by his means procured a safe conduct from the Emperor; but when they were to meet, *Macedonius* put off his Patriarchal Badge, otherwise probably *Euphemius* would have refus'd even that Civil kindness at his Hands.

Theodosius Letter, p. 260. and Not. Valeti. in locum.

Some time after *Anastasius* A. D. 518, expelled *Macedonius* if we believe *Libertinus*, for falsifying the Scriptures and being a *Nestorian*, but as the common and true Story goes for refusing to condemn the Council of *Chalcedon*: *Timotheus* succeeds Him, a Man very infamous and Heretical, and therefore it cannot be thought *Macedonius*

Lib. Diss. Breviar. Council tom. 5. l. 19.

Theodorus LeBar, p. 563, and 564.

would communicate with Him, since so many of *Constantinople* suffer'd for refusing his Communion, and re-
bell'd against the Emperor who would force them to it. This *Timotheus* was not expell'd by *Anastasius*, as the *Pamphlets* pretends: He dy'd in his Throne, and was succeeded by *John*.

was

was to make all the friends he could to put a stop to prevailing Heresy, and 'tis no wonder if to secure the Faith of the Church, Crimes of *lesser moment* were overlookt.

The same *Anastasius*, says the Pamphlet, expel'd *Elias* of *Jerusalem*, and put *John* into his Throne, yet *Elias* did not with-draw from his Communion, and *Theodorus* and *Sabas*, the mighty Monks of that time, communicated with *Elias*, and *John* too; and the names of *Elias* and *John* were both put into the *Diptychs* of *Jerusalem*: and for all this it quotes the Life of *Sabas* written by *Cyril* of *Scythopolis*. Now the legend of *Cyril* runs thus: *Elias* was driven from *Jerusalem* by force, and *John* who had promis'd to Anathematize the Council of *Chalcedon* was put into his Room: (p. 310.) *John* being perswaded by *Sabas* breaks his promise, and the Emperor sends the Governor of *Palestine* to force *John* to keep his word, or leave his Throne. He seizes *John* and puts him into Prison, and all the People of *Jerusalem* reject *John* (p. 311.) *John* again gives his word to do as he had promis'd, but in the mean time gathers 10000 Monks about him (p. 312.) and getting into the Pulpit with *Theodorus* and *Sabas*, the Ringleaders of those Monks, anathematized all those who did not receive the Council of *Chalcedon*, and confirm'd that Synod (p. 312.) The Governor was forc'd to fly for his Life, and *Hypatius*, the Emperor's Nephew, was glad to purchase his with many Oaths, and a round sum of Money.

The Emperor resenting this affront, resolv'd to banish *John* and *Theodosius*, and *Sabas*: but the Monks got together again; wrote a remonstrance to the Emperor, in which they call *John* *ὁ ἁγίος Ἀρχιεπίσκοπος*

(p. 319.) and boldly tell Him they would sooner lose their Lives, and burn their Churches, than suffer his Heresy to be set up in them. Thus this matter ended. And sure Men must be at a strange loss who would take Examples from such wretched irregular proceedings.

For the next instance the Pamphlet sends us to the Life of *Acacius*, and says we may read there how *Acacius* unjustly depriv'd *Maximus* Bishop of *Jerusalem*, and put *Cyril* in his Room, one who was then chief of the *Arrian* party, but afterward becoming *Orthodox* he was willingly received, and allow'd as *Patriarch* by the Church: and *Maximus* himself did not with-draw from his Communion; whereas all that I can find about *Maximus* and *Cyril* in that Treatise are these words.

*Ἀκούοντες ὁμιλοῦντες τὸν Μαξιμὸν καὶ πατριάρχου δὲ τὸν τῆς ἀντιόχειας πρὸς Ἀμύν ἐπίσκοπον Ἐφεσουλμαίον ἰσχυροτάτους, καὶ Μαξιμὸν ἑσθιωτὴν καὶ ἀντιπαύσαντα καὶ πολλοὺς, ἀσπάζοντο αὐτὸν ὡς ἱεροῦσιν τοιαῦτα τὰ τῆς ἀντιόχειας καὶ ἀποστόλου. Acacius threw out Maximus, and established Cyril, who was Zealous for Heresy, as Maximus for true Faith. Not one word of Maximus's communicating with Cyril, nor can it be suppos'd so glorious a Confessor as Maximus would have any thing to do with one of such a Character. Besides, Sir, this whole story depends on the single Authority of *Sozocrates*, who says *Acacius* and *Patrophilus* having driven *Maximus* out of his Throne put *Cyril* in his Room. But *Theodorus* is positive that *Cyril* succeeded upon the death of *Maximus*: Μαξιμὸν δὲ οὐ τὸν ἀφ' οὗ μὲν ταπεινῶντος σὺν πολλοῖς τῆς ἐκκλησίας χρίσας ἐβίβη. And the Councils at *Constantinople* Synodical Epistle says *Cyril* was canonically ordain'd: Θεοδορίῳ Ἐκκλησ. Hist. l. 5. c. 9. ἀποκαταστάσαν, καὶ ἐπαρξάντατον χυρῶν ἐκκλησίας ἐκείνης ὡς ἡμεῖς καὶ πατριάρχου καὶ πατρὸς τῶν τῆς ἐκκλησίας χυρῶν ἐκκλησίας πάλιν. Yet after all this I must refer you*

p. 18. A.D. 703.

Platina vit.
Sergii. primi.Pauli Diaconi.
Hist. Mijcel. l.
19. c. 30.Pauli Diaconi.
Hist. Mijcel. l.
20. c. 9.Baronius A. D.
703.vid. Baronium.
An. 72.
pag. 18.An. D. 730. vid.
Pauli Diacon.
Mijcel. l. 19. l. 1.
c. 26.vid. Spanhem.
Eist. Imag. 518.
2. num. 12.

their own Cause, and declaim against those Emperors who threw down Images, and would not let them be *Idolaters*. God has given them over to believe a Lye, and the Men of that party are as insincere Writers, as the Author I am now considering. But suppose *Germanus* was depos'd, is not Idolatry a sufficient Cause for Deposition? And is not a worshipping of Images justly banisht from the Church?

The following long Story about *Tarasius* and others, is altogether impertinent: for what if *Tarasius* for fear of losing his pretty Purses, did not do his duty, and Excommunicate *Joseph* for his villainous compliance with the Emperor *Constantine*? What though *Theodorus* refus'd to communicate with *Tarasius* whilst he kept *Joseph* in the Church? What though *Irene* (that admirable Empress) lookt upon *Theodorus* to be an honest honest Man, and *Tarasius* to be a Courtier? What though upon *Joseph's* deprivation, *Theodorus* & *Tarasius* were reconciled? And what though *Nice-*

Callistus assisted *Leontius* & encouraged the People to dethrone *Fustinian*, cut off his Nose and banish him: He appear'd at the Convention summoned by *Leontius*, and urged them on to their loyal and Religious work, by telling them this was the Day the Lord had made. *Fustinian* recovering his Throne again, us'd *Callistus* as he did the other Rebels, put out his Eyes, and banish'd him, and placed *Cyrus* in his Room. The Collector says *Callistus* did not refuse to communicate with *Cyrus*; but that is more than he knows; the Histories speak nothing of the matter. *Callistus* might refuse, and no body take notice of it; for who would regard the Actions of a poor blind Creature, without worth, and without friends, and who was sent to *Rome* to beg his Bread of a proud haughty Pope, whom he had very much offended.

John the next depos'd Patriarch was a Heretick, (as the Editor himself seems willing to grant upon the Authority of *Zonaras* and *Nicephorus Callisti*) and *Germanus* was not depos'd by *Leo Isaurus*, but resign'd his Bishoprick. I know *Dimasen*, *Constantine*, the Eastern Synodical Epistle to *Theophilus*, and others, say he was depos'd; but those passionate Doters upon Images deserve little credit when they plead

their own Cause, and declaim against those Emperors who threw down Images, and would not let them be *Idolaters*. God has given them over to believe a Lye, and the Men of that party are as insincere Writers, as the Author I am now considering. But suppose *Germanus* was depos'd, is not Idolatry a sufficient Cause for Deposition? And is not a worshipping of Images justly banisht from the Church?

John the succeeding Patriarch at the instance of the Emperor receiv'd *Joseph* again, and *Theodorus* withdrew again, and those two were again reconciled upon *Joseph's* second deprivation? What though *Theodorus* retracted all the Reproaches he had thrown out against *Tarasius* and *Nicephorus*? What though the Monks of *Studium* were condemned by *Metabolus* for persisting in their separation; and some body says, that *Theodorus* did not well in separating from *Tarasius* and *Nicephorus*, and that afterwards he corrected himself, and made amends for his unjustifiable proceedings? What I say (suppose the whole Story true) doth all this prove? Doth it show, that a Bishop unjustly deprived, communicates with his Orthodox Successor? There is not one word of any one's deprivation, but *Joseph's*; and he was neither a Bishop, nor unjustly punished. And yet the Collector has the Confidence to say (p. 30.) *non solum in romana ecclesia, sed in universis locis, &c.* This is the scope and design of the Histories here produc'd, to show that not one of all those Patriarchs that were Unjustly and Un canonically thrust out of their proper Sees, did ever withdraw himself from the Communion of his Successor, or persuade the People to separate from the Church, but that both they and their People continued in Communion, provided their Successors were Orthodox.

Of the next Story I am willing to believe as much as I can find true. I will allow *Ignatius* was thrown out of his Seat by *Michael*, for throwing out and Excommunicating the Incessant *Bardas*, as *Ignatius* himself relates the Story to *Pope Nicholas*. I will likewise grant that *Ignatius* was restor'd and *Photius* deprived (there an *Intruder* is turn'd out) and that *Photius* replaced in the Throne after *Ignatius* was dead: But that *Photius* was lookt upon to be an Adulterer, and Usurper of the Throne (which this Collector questions,) and that *Ignatius* refus'd to communicate with him (which he deays,) is very evident from the best Records of that Age: *Ignatius* in the account of his Case which he sent to *Pope Nicholas*, calls *Photius*, Adulterer and Intruder, Adulterum & intrusum Photium. He declined the sentence of the Pope's Legats, because they did not reject, but eat with and received Presents from that Adulterer *Photius*. And (not to trouble you with a thousand other Records) *Pope Nicholas* by himself, and in conjunction with the Roman Synod, refuses his Communion, and deposeth him too, because he had been ordain'd by *Gregory of Syrachis*.

An. D. 851.

vid. Baronium
An. 961. N. 28.
and 31.pag. 29.
pag. 30. &Baronius A. D.
851. N. 21. and
An. 896. N. 23.

an excommunicated Bishop; usurp'd another's Right, and got into the Throne of *Constantinople* whilst *Ignatius* was alive:

Baronius An. D. 862. Vivente ac Superfite Confessore Ignatio, sedem ejus invadit, & Sponfam, violentius rapit & Secleratus Adulter. Several Bishops and others stuck to *Ignatius*,

Baronius A. 859. N. 57, and 59.

and would not communicate with *Photius*; and *Ignatius* was so far from communicating with him,

that he lay very hard upon all that did so, suspended *Photius* himself, and all that were ordain'd or com-

municated with him, and was for inflicting upon them all the highest Censures of the Church.

By this time I believe you begin to stand amaz'd at the confident Ignorance of this distinguished *Scribber*, who produceth the Example of *Ignatius*, and is positive that he never refus'd to communicate with *Photius*; nor indeed could he have pitch'd upon an Instance, which will more effectually ruin his whole design than this. For *Ignatius* was depos'd by the *Constantinopolitan Synod* under *Photius*, because, as they pretended, he was not canonically

ordained; nor did ever a greater

Fig. 29. Schism follow any Bishop's deprivation.

But the *Collector* cannot believe that *Photius*, had he been thrust out as an Usurper, would have been replac'd in the same Throne: His Infidelity proceeds from Ignorance, for any Man who knows the time, and Men of the Age, will never admire at any strange and irregular proceedings in it.

Before I go to the next Instance, I must advertise the *Editor* of his mis-

take about the *Synodicon*.

For the *Synodicon* was not, as he imagins, the Decree made against the *Iconomachi*, by the Synod at *Constantinople* under *Michael* and *Theodora*. A. D. 842. appointed to be read in the Greek Churches every

Year upon the first Sunday in *Lent*, but the Book composed A. D. 920. in the Reigns of *Constantine* and *Romanus*; it contained three

* Synods, two about Faith, and the third about Marriages, and was to be read every Year in *July*:

This Edict was made to

* Compare *Anast. Caesar. apud Cotelerii 3. tom. Mon. r. c. p. 432. with Baronius An. 921. N. 1, and 3.*

close up the Divisions, and heal the breaches of the Church, and particularly to put an end to that

Schism, which follow'd *Nicholas's* deprivation: for

many adhered to him, & rejected *Euthymius* whom the Emperor put into his room; and the succeeding Emperor restor'd *Nicholas* and expell'd *Euthymius*, who was barbarously us'd as an In-

truder: *Adulterum vocabant ut qui ad alienam uxorem in-*

gressus esset, nempe Nicolai Ecclesiam acceperat.

This is a full demonstration that *Nicholas* and his

party did not communicate with *Euthymius*, that there was a Schism fol-

lowed his deprivation, and that this

Story-teller cannot speak Truth. The Edict of

Union was a kind of an Act of Oblivion, all Irregularities were to be forgotten, and all Persons, how-

ever culpable, to be lookt upon as faultless and regular; and he that will thence infer (as the *Col-*

lector pretends to do) that there were no Schisms in the Church, upon the unjust deprivation of one

Bishop, and the intrusion of another, and that the Intruder's Communion was not still avoided, may

as well prove that we had no Civil Wars, because

twenty Years after an Act of Indemnity set all right again, and forbade the *Loyalists* and *Rebels* to

reproach or speak ill of one another: So that *Pho-*

tius, whilst *Ignatius* was alive, and *Stephen* and *Anthony*, whilst *Photius* was alive, were lookt upon

to be Intruders; till a great many Years after Peace was to be established, and the many Schisms their

Irregularities had caus'd, were to be heal'd up.

Of *Cosmus Aricus*, who was depriv'd by *Michael*,

Story speaks very little; yet had the Author given us all

that *Chronicler* says concerning him, he would have lost

one Instance, though he would have shew'd himself honest, but to falsify

and misrepresent is the peculiar Talent of this

Author. *Cosmus* being under the Emperor's dis-

pleasure, was charg'd with Conspiracies against the Emperor, and with some very odd Opinions

start'd by one *Nepho* a Monk: The Emperor calls a Synod, and *Cosmus* is convicted and depriv'd;

Cosmus curses the Empress, excommunicates some of the Nobles, and bitterly rails at the Council for

deposing

An. D. 901.

Constantianus Porphyrogenitus Pref. ad E. d. d. Unionis apud Baronium An. 901. N. 6.

and Caropolates apud eundem, An. 911.

N. 18.

Page 33.

The Editor

the Editor

Eng.

If any

A. a se

Altar,

or Pier

bitious

adhere

the Lay

second,

this Ser

If any

Church

do what

or a P

an Ana

If any

shop,

Congr

to sub

monit

incap

factio

let the

tious b

If any

the fan

tence a

any oth

Bishop

own B

Council

The

be Ch

deposi

one ma

A. D. 11

Num. 3

deposing him: By this temper and carriage, any one may conclude he was not very quiet after his Deposition; but we hear no more of *A.D. 1147.* him; and *Baronius* says, he dy'd presently after his Deposition.

The last Story is not worth examining; and now, *Sir*, pray reflect a little: This is *R. B's excellent Treatise*, in which there are not two words to the purpose, nor one of Truth. This is that Antiquity which we admire the 6th, 7th, 8th and following Ages, the great disgraces of Christianity, and which should always be forgotten.

The Canons being part of the M. S. not published by the Editor of the Greek and Latin, nor in the English Edition.

If any Presbyter despising his own Bishop, gathers a separate Congregation, and raiseth another Altar, having nothing to object against the Faith or Piety of his Bishop, let him be depos'd as Abbitious and Turbulent. Let all the Clergy that adhere to him lie under the same Censures: and the Lay-Men be excommunicated. But let the first, second, and third Admonition of the Bishop precede this Sentence, *Canon. Apost. 31.*

If any gathers a Congregation separate from the Church, and despising the Church shall presume to do what belongs to the Church without the Bishop, or a Presbyter Licen'd by the Bishop, let him be an Anathema; *Council. Gang. Can. 7th.*

If any Presbyter or Deacon despising his own Bishop, separates from the Church, gathers a private Congregation, and sets up an Altar, and refuseth to submit to his Bishop after the first and second Admonition, let him be depriv'd, and for ever made incapable of officiating again: And if he continues factious, and raiseth disturbances in the Church, let the Secular power take hold of him, as a Seditious breaker of the Peace. *Synod. Antioch. Canon. 5th.*

If any Bishop be accus'd before all the Bishops of the same Province, and they all agree in their Sentence against Him, let not his Cause be reheard by any other, but let the unanimous Sentence of all the Bishops of the Province stand good. *Can. 15th.*

If any Presbyter puffed up with Pride against his own Bishop makes a Schism, let him be Anathema, *Council. Carth. Can. 10.*

The Devil having scatter'd Heretical Tares in the Church, and finding the Sword of the Spirit has

cut them up by the Roots, falls upon another Service, and endeavours to divide the Body of Christ by the madness of Schismatics. To baffle this contrivance the holy Synod decrees; If any Presbyter or Deacon shall presume upon pretence that his Bishop is guilty of great misdemeanors to withdraw from his communion before his Cause has been examin'd & determin'd by a Synod, and not mention his Name in publick Prayers according to the Custom of the Church; let him be depriv'd and degraded: For he that is a bare Presbyter, and pretends to the power of the Metropolitans, and as far as in him lies condemns his own Father and Bishop, before they have given sentence is unworthy both the name and dignity of a Presbyter; let the Clergy who joyn with him be under the same Censures, and the Monks and Lay-Men stand excommunicated, till they renounce the Schismatics, and be reconciled to their own Bishop; *Synod. A.D. a. nai 8. Canon. 13.*

If any Bishop upon pretence that his Metropolitan is guilty of great Misdemeanors, shall separate from his Communion, and not mention his Name in publick Prayers according to custom, the Holy Synod declares him depriv'd upon being convicted of withdrawing from his Metropolitans Communion, and making a Schism: for every Man should know his own bounds. A Presbyter must not despise his Bishop, nor a Bishop his Metropolitan, *Synod. ejusd. Canon. 14.*

If any Bishop or Metropolitan shall presume to withdraw from the Communion of his Patriarch, and not mention his Name in publick Prayers according to custom; but raises a Schism before a Synod has examin'd the Cause and given Sentence, the holy Synod declares him depriv'd upon Conviction.

These Canons are made against those who divide from their Governors, upon pretence they are guilty of some Irregularitys and Misdemeanors: for those that separate from them when they openly profess, and teach any Heresy condemned by the holy Synods and Fathers of the Church, are not liable to the Censures of these Canons, if they withdraw from their Bishop before a Synod has examin'd the Cause and given Sentence; but are to be lookt upon, and receiv'd as Orthodox. For they do not fly a Bishop but a false Bishop and a false Teacher: they do not break the Church's Unity by Schism; but endeavour to preserve the Church from Schisms and Divisions.

These

These are the Canons at the end of the *Karacian M.S.* written in the same Hand, on the same Paper, and join'd in the same Page with the other part that is published. The reason why these were concealed is very evident: The *Collector* of the Storys was to be thought a Man of Ingenuity and Judgment, and 'tis certain that could not be had this latter part been published together with the former: for who could think him to have either Modesty or Sense who writes a Treatise on purpose to prove that a Bishop, howsoever depriv'd, whether by the Edict of a Senate, or a Prince, or plain force, is bound to communicate with him who is put in his place, provided he be Orthodox, and yet produces Canons which imperatorially decree him a Schismatick, who separates either from his Bishop or Metropolitan, before a Synod has examin'd the Cause and given Sentence?

* vid. Coteléri. Not. ad 3. Tom. Mon. Grec. p. 625.
 It is probable this was that *Sophist* who usurp'd the Throne of Arlesius the Patriarch of C. P. who was unjustly deposed by a temporary Synod, called by the perjured *Usurper* Michael Palaeologus, who being constituted Guardian to the Patriarch of the young Prince, John Lascaris put out his Sight and usurp'd his Throne. *Demetrius* the Patriarch communicated him for his Usurpation, in *Disobedience*, and because he refused to depose him, he called a Council to depose him, and upon his deposition followed a great and bloody schism, by which the whole Story in *Princedom* is now a Schism.

the Act of a depriv'd Bishop, before the Council, from this part of the *M.S.* that Bishop who ever he was, was depriv'd by a Synod; and had *P. A.* known this, doubtless he would have given another account of this Treatise, than he has done in his Preface.

There are a great many other faults in the *M.S.* which I forbear to mention, being willing to make an End. Then I will only add that it gives no great credit to a cause, whose Men of parts and learning lay such mighty stress on such crude false unpolish'd Papers.

The Truth is, with due respect to Mr *A.* Curious, and Mr *B.* Observation: the discovery is to far from being extraordinary or Miraculous, that I wonder some ignorant Popish Priest upon the bare reading the Latin Title of it, in the Catalogue of the *Karacian M.S.* which runs thus, *Exemplum ex Historic Ecclesiasticis coram populo Canones de Iovann. Paterarchalis ecclesiasticis, et ceteris* &c. *Episcopus* *Episcopus* *Episcopus* had not without farther consideration than we can see published the same, as an Apology for Schism, or the like Ecclesiastical Controversies, which Powers were to deprive as well as depend, who since the *Convent* Clergy would then have given of this *M.S.* their own Conscience can best tell, and most will think it easy to imagine: at least there would have been no occasion for the present labour of

24. 11. 11. Dir.
 Your Humble Servant,

FINIS

